Ham-Policy Digest   Wed, 31 Aug 94   Volume 94 : Issue 409

Today's Topics:
                       Assorted items of intere
                         More Code. (2 msgs)
                  Tandy's Proposed Family Radio Service

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: Tue, 30 Aug 94 16:46:00 -0400
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!swrinde!howland.reston.ans.net!gatech!udel!
news.sprintlink.net!ns.channel1.com!channel1!alan.wilensk@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Assorted items of intere
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

I love you all dearly, but I must lurk for a while. Business is really
picking up. I leave the good men and women of the cw abolitionist party
to carry on, carry on. I will be with you in spirit.

There is no doubt in my mind, now having researched the issue, that the
manual morse era has seen its day outside of ham radio. So we who are
determined to wipe the CW TEST off the face of this earth (or at least
relegate it to the scoring level shared by other modes)must carry on in
more contstructive ways. Our internet days have been fun, but it is time
to collect our resources and act.

Carrying on an essentialy unwinable argument with the likes of Messers.
Herman and Wynn will not cause the CW test to suddenly vanish when they
come around to our point of view. They have their own battle to fight

once a critical mass of concerned operators starts the ball rolling to
kill what they love more than, dare I say, their own children.

In my opinion, the ground swell of new licensees in and of itself will
be a fertile ground for the sowing of the appropriate petitions. Dare I
say that there may someday be an alternative to the ARRL.

I heartily urge all who hold dear this dream of the elimination or
modification of the morse code testing requirments in the ARS to :

1) Stop casting pearls before swine on the internet, and take action
by--

2> Sending ME your name, address and biography, via email

3> Form a group to change the Staus Quo.

4> I will keep the mailing list, and try to jump start the operation

5> We will need a respected and elder Ham sympathetic to the cause to
act as mouthpiece

Gentlemen, ladies...fight fiercly, fight fiercly, do your duty, grasp
hold of your destiny....and dont waste another minute with the bozo's
unless you just need a good argument. Save it for the FCC.

Alan Wilensky, N1SSO
abm@world.std.com

¿ CmpQwk #UNREG¿ UNREGISTERED EVALUATION COPY

Date: 30 Aug 1994 19:42:03 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!news.cerf.net!hacgate2.hac.com!usenet@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: More Code.
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article 29AUG199415092383@elroy.uh.edu, st3qi@elroy.uh.edu (Brad Killebrew
N5LJV) writes:
>I've been reading the same conversations about Morse code in this
>news group for the past year or so. And, frankly, it's getting real
>old. Mostly what I've been reading lately is a bunch of messages where
>people are REALLY REACHING for excuses not to learn the code!!

That's funny, the messages I've been reading have been about reasons not to
require the code, rather than reasons not to learn it.

>Beleive me, if the majority of amateurs did not want the Morse code
>as a requirement, the FCC would probably drop it. On the same note, there
>is NOT a majority represented here on Intenet.

I doubt that the FCC has any idea what the majority opinion would be.

>So, for right now, the fact remains that Morse code IS a requirment,
>and if you can't hack it, please stop complaining.

I don't consider trying to understand and debate the basis for maintaining
the code requirement to be "complaining." The fact that it IS a requirement
is not a very persuading argument for keeping it so. And, for the record,
I am "hacking it". I'll let you know in two weeks if I pass 1b or 1c.

> You can be using
>your energy to do something contsructive rather than writing anti-code
>messages.

>Am I the only one who thinks this?

No, you're not. You are also not the only one who is mistakenly assuming
that many of those opposing the code requirement haven't already passed it.

-Brian

Date: 30 Aug 1994 15:45 CDT
From: library.ucla.edu!csulb.edu!nic-nac.CSU.net!charnel.ecst.csuchico.edu!
yeshua.marcam.com!zip.eecs.umich.edu!newsxfer.itd.umich.edu!gatech!swrinde!
news.uh.edu!elroy.uh.edu!@@ihnp4.ucsd.edu
Subject: More Code.
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <33ulpm$dd2@nntpd.lkg.dec.com>, little@iamu.chi.dec.com (Todd Little)
writes...
>
>In article <29AUG199415092383@elroy.uh.edu>, st3qi@elroy.uh.edu (Brad Killebrew
N5LJV) writes:
>|>I've been reading the same conversations about Morse code in this
>|>news group for the past year or so. And, frankly, it's getting real
>|>old. Mostly what I've been reading lately is a bunch of messages where
>|>people are REALLY REACHING for excuses not to learn the code!!
>
>Oh boy, another "quit whining" argument! Not very original, or very applicable
>to most of the people arguing against the current code requirements. Would
>you be specific and tell us who you are refering to? Certainly not those

```
>of us who've passed the irrelevent code requirement?
>
>|>Beleive me, if the majority of amateurs did not want the Morse code
>|>as a requirement, the FCC would probably drop it.  On the same note, there
>|>is NOT a majority represented here on Intenet.
>
>Right, and just how would the FCC have a clue as to what the majority
>of amateurs want?  Have you seen them conduct some scientific poll?
>
>|>So, for right now, the fact remains that Morse code IS a requirment,
>|>and if you can't hack it, please stop complaining.  You can be using
>|>your energy to do something contsructive rather than writing anti-code
>|>messages.
>
>What about those of us that *can* hack it?  What's your argument?  Please
>have one, as I haven't seen one yet that can show a logical connection
>between demonstrating proficency in Morse code and gaining non-Morse
>code privileges.
>
>Actually I'm hoping for enlightenment.  Some otherwise intelligent acting
>folks seem to argue so fervently for maintaining the apparentlty illogical
>status quo that I figure I must be missing something obvious.  Otherwise,
>advocating the elimination or rationalization of an illogical requirement
>seems like a good thing on the whole of it.  Otherwise what's to keep the
>FCC from deciding that being left handed is a requirement for becoming
>a ham?  Seems we've already set a pretty poor precedent allowing the
>creation of "incentive" licensing in the first place.
>
>I'd rather argue for a stronger PRB-1 and more stringent RFI requirement
>on consumer electronics gear, but few in this group seem to care about
>those things.  Maybe when enough readers here find themselves in a position
>that severely restricts their activities it will become "important" enough,
>although by that time it will be too late.  You see, in a democracy, the
>majority (owners of consumer electronics gear or those desirous of ticky
>tacky little boxes all in a row) can do what they want to the minority (that's
>us hams.)
>
>|>Am I the only one who thinks this?
>
>No, I'm sure there are others that share your minority view.  ;-)
>
>So what's your burning issue?
>
>73,
>Todd
>N9MWB

Er, what?  I think I was specific as I need to be.  Todd, I've received
```

TONS of e-mail from people totally agreeing with me. But what's sad about
it is that they don't want to post here because they don't want to get
into the middle of a stupid arguement, or have to take the time out of
their busy work schedule to reply to irrelevent anti-code messages.

The majority of e-mail I've received basically say this: Your fighting
a lost cause, and wasting bandwidth. So, what else do I need to say?
I guess I've just spoken for the silent majority.

Sorry, Todd, but I will not entertain you with future replies. I'm done.

--
Brad A. Killebrew N5LJV, EMT-B | Student of Computer Engr Technology
President, University of Houston ARC | University of Houston, Texas
Internet: n5ljv@uh.edu | U of H Amateur Radio Club WB5FND
AMPRnet : n5ljv@sugarland.ampr.org | uharc@post-office.uh.edu
Packet : n5ljv@f6cnb.#setx.tx.usa.na | Box 85-T2, 4800 Calhoun, 77204-4083
AT&Tnet : 713-743-6676 Fax 743-4032 | For info, finger st3qi@jetson.uh.edu

----

Date: 30 Aug 1994 15:18:35 -0500
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!swrinde!news.uh.edu!uuneo.neosoft.com!Starbase.NeoSoft.COM!
nobody@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Tandy's Proposed Family Radio Service
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <33v39v$r8@ra.nrl.navy.mil>,
David Drumheller <drumhell@claudette.nrl.navy.mil> wrote:
>   Actually, with some modification, the creation of a family radio
>service could be a good idea.

There is actually a good example. Japan has a "personal" radio band at
903-905 MHz. 5 Watt max, no repeaters. EVERYONE has one. All the Japanese
radio manufacturers make radios. They're pretty cheap, by comparison.

I truly believe the FCC would like to see Amateur Radio become this. Before
getting too many danders up...think about it. With the no-code license, ham
radio is available to many more people than before. Why not market it this
way? It might just save a few MHz from the spectrum grabbers...

--

   Jim Reese, WD5IYT | Chief Engineer, KODA Sunny 99.1 FM
  jreese@neosoft.com | "Not responsible for program content..."

End of Ham-Policy Digest V94 #409
****